DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 714 UD 022 067

TITLE Summer Jobs for Youth '81 Program. Final Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY New York State Education Dept., Albany. Bureau of School Libraries.
PUB DATE [81]
NOTE 22p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Disadvantaged Youth; High Schools; *Job Training; School Business Relationship; Secondary School Students; *Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; Summer Programs; Surveys; *Work Experience Programs; *Youth Employment

ABSTRACT

The Summer Jobs for Youth Program (1981) was established by the New York City Partnership to develop private sector summer jobs for economically disadvantaged youth. The evaluation of the program was based upon a telephone survey of company executives, job site supervisors, youth workers who participated in the program, companies who made summer job commitments and later cancelled them, and participants in the 1980 program who chose not to participate in 1981. The survey found that young workers were the most cooperative respondents, whereas employers who cancelled job orders were the most reluctant respondents. The majority of youth workers rated each of nine areas of the job experience as excellent or good. The large majority of company executives and job site supervisors reacted positively to the program. The majority of company executives and workers said they would participate in a similar program the following year. The majority of job site supervisors said that the young workers' performance was average or better than average. (JCD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212714

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Project Number: 0427-00-00000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH '81 PROGRAM

New York City Public Schools
SJYF/'81 Coordinator:

Patricia Jordan
Office of the Deputy
Chancellor

Prepared by the

ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT

Sharon Walker, Manager
Earl Preston Thomas, Consultant
Judith Lane, Consultant

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
RICHARD GUTTENBERG, ADMINISTRATOR

UD022067

A SUMMARY OF THE EVALUATION
FOR THE
SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH/'81 PROGRAM

The Summer Jobs for Youth/'81 (SJFY/'81) Program was an effort of the New York City Partnership to develop private sector summer jobs for New York City economically disadvantaged youth. During late July and the early part of August, 1981, a telephone survey was conducted to evaluate the reactions of the participants and identify any benefits they gained. The five respondent groups surveyed were: (1) company executives, (2) job site supervisors, (3) young workers who accepted summer jobs in the private sector, (4) companies that made summer job commitments and later cancelled them, and (5) youth from the top 15 percent of the 1980 public sector jobs program, who chose not to participate in the private sector Summer Jobs for Youth '81 Program. Questionnaires were developed for each respondent group and a total of 835 interviews were completed.

The large majority of company executives, job site supervisors, and young workers reacted positively to the program. Eighty-nine percent of the company executives would participate in a similar program next year, 88 percent of the job site supervisors thought that the young workers' performance was average or better, and 84 percent of the young workers said they would accept the same job next year. Most company executives and young workers also said they gained a number of benefits from their participation in the program. Other findings are summarized below.

Company Executives

The overwhelming majority of the company executives (89 percent) indicated they would participate in the SJFY/'81 Program next year. Of the remaining 11 percent, only one declined to participate next year; the others were undecided. More than one-third (36 percent) of the respondents stated they would participate next year for community or public service reasons, 27 percent were convinced by the performance of the young workers on their current summer jobs, and 37 percent felt the company would benefit from continued participation in SJFY/'81. The program areas most often cited as needing improvement were the screening and referral process (28 percent), and the preparation of the student workers (49 percent). Fifty-six (90 percent) executives indicated they would provide a written reference for young workers.

Job Site Supervisors

Eighty-eight percent of the job site supervisors rated the performance of young workers as average or above average. Supervisors felt the area where students needed the most improvement was in attitudes and behavior (51 percent of the respondents selected this answer.) Seventy percent of the job site supervisors indicated that young workers had received some form of orientation, but only 48 percent of the supervisors had themselves received any materials or orientation to SJFY/'81.

Young Workers

Young workers were overwhelmingly positive about the program. Eighty-four percent indicated they would accept the same job next summer and 94 percent felt the job experience had been worthwhile. When young workers were asked to rate their summer job experience on nine specific areas, 76 to 95 percent of the ratings were good to excellent. A little over one-half of the respondents, 57 percent, participated in some orientation activity prior to attending an employer interview.

Cancelled Job Orders

Forty-four percent of the cancelled job orders in the sample indicated the reason for the cancellation was a lack of referrals or a lack of applicants. An additional 9 percent hired other summer workers.

15 Percent Preferred Young Workers

One-fourth (27 percent) of the 15 percent preferred young workers sampled did not receive the initial job service letter or subsequent follow-through. Seventeen percent preferred their prior public sector job because of the tasks, conditions, or staff; and an additional 17 percent went to employer interviews, but did not receive private sector job offers. Eighty-eight percent of the respondents, who were asked if they would accept a job in the private sector next year, stated they would, and the remaining 12 percent were not certain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
	LIST OF TABLES	iv
I.	PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	1
II.	EVALUATION DESIGN	1
III.	SAMPLE	2
IV.	EVALUATION RESULTS	5
V.	CONCLUSIONS	6
	APPENDIX	7
	TABLES 1 - 24	8

Young Workers

Of the 419 young workers interviewed, 57 percent were female and 43 percent were male. The racial/ethnic composition of the group was 66 percent black, 19 percent hispanic, 6 percent oriental, 8 percent white, and about one percent from other racial ethnic groups. All of the young workers in the sample were enrolled in public high schools. The majority of the young workers sampled attended comprehensive academic high schools (85 percent). An additional 12 percent were enrolled in vocational schools and the remaining 3 percent were enrolled in alternative or specialized schools. More than half of the young workers (57.4 percent) were less than 18 years of age. The remaining 42.6 percent ranged in age from 18 to 22.

Most young workers were employed in clerical jobs (60 percent), the second largest job classification was manual labor which contained 21 percent of the young workers interviewed. An additional 10 percent were employed in sales or service, 8 percent were in technical jobs, and one respondent (1 percent) held a laboratory position.

As a group, the young workers were overwhelmingly positive about the program. A large majority, 84 percent, indicated they would accept the same job next summer. An even larger majority (94 percent) felt the job had been a good or worthwhile experience.

Young workers were asked to rate nine areas of the SJFY/'81 job experience excellent, good, fair, or poor in terms of how much they gained. Most respondents rated the nine areas excellent or good. The combined percentage of respondents indicating excellent or good for each area were: (1) skills, 88 percent; (2) training and instruction, 88 percent; (3) exposure to other jobs, 76 percent; (4) work habits, 94 percent; (5) motivation, 95 percent; (6) understanding what it is like to work, 97 percent; (7) confidence in own ability to learn, 98 percent, (8) gaining self-reliance, 97 percent; and (9) developing a positive attitude about accepting criticism, 92 percent.

Over half of the respondents (57 percent) attended an orientation activity or program prior to being sent out for an employer interview. Forty-one percent of the respondents did not participate in any orientation activities. (SJFY/'81 program administrators stated in an interview that pre-employment activities which were considered essential, were planned, but for a variety of reasons were not conducted as scheduled).

Nearly three-fourths of the young workers (74 percent) had some prior work experience in the public sector. A large majority of the respondents (86 percent) stated they possessed all the skills necessary to perform on their SJFY/'81 jobs. Forty-nine young workers (12 percent) indicated they had some problems on the job, but only 15 (4 percent) had ever called the counseling number. Over one-third of the respondents (38 percent) were not aware of the counseling number.

Cancelled Job Orders

Fifty percent of the companies that committed jobs in the spring and later cancelled those job orders were retail, manufacturing, maintenance/service, or repairs/construction concerns. The other half of the companies covered a wide range of categories such as legal services, paper products and real estate. Nearly 44 percent of the respondents indicated that either a lack of applicants or a lack of agency referrals was the reason they cancelled the job order. A number of respondents cited multiple reasons for cancelling job orders. For example, respondents who indicated applicants were not qualified also indicated they hired other summer workers, needed help at unusual hours, or cited other reasons as contributing to the cancellation of jobs. Multiple responses from respondents were coded when survey workers were unable to elicit a single clear reason for cancelling a job order.

15 Percent Preferred Young Workers from 1980 Public Sector Program

The majority of the 15 percent preferred young workers (57 percent) were less than 18 years of age and the remainder (43 percent) were 18 to 21 years old. Approximately 17 percent of the respondents preferred the job tasks, work setting, or staff relationships at their prior public sector job and therefore did not accept private sector employment. Another 14 percent returned to their public sector jobs because those jobs were closer to their homes.

Twenty-seven percent of the respondents received no initial letter or agency follow-through, or moved. Of the 30 students in this category, three moved; the remainder did not have contacts with a referral source.

Fifteen percent of the respondents received notification from a referral source, but failed to follow-up after being notified. Seventeen percent of the group returned to public sector jobs because there were no other jobs available or because they were not offered jobs in the private sector after completing an employer interview. Six percent of the group either did not meet the age criteria for a particular job or had a school related conflict. Four precent of the students did not return to a public sector job after declining the SJFY/'81 private sector offer.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A large majority of the company executives, supervisors, and young workers showed strong positive feelings about the SJFY/'81 Program. Usually, generalizations based on a sample must be qualified, but there are some aspects of the survey that strengthen the findings. First, all three of the respondent groups cited above were more than willing to share their feelings about the program and were generous in the amount of time they allotted to the interviews. The young workers were easily the most cooperative respondent group surveyed. Company executives and supervisors were somewhat guarded in the early phase of the interview process because they had no foreknowledge of the SJFY/'81 survey. Another remarkable pattern was the high level of enthusiasm and spontaniety the respondents exhibited when answering the questions

posed to them. It may be significant that all three of these groups appeared genuine in their desire to discuss the program.

The most dificult interviews to conduct were those with employers who cancelled job orders. Many of the respondents in this group seemed reluctant to talk and often gave vague or confusing responses.

There is another point that bears mentioning. All of the respondent groups had some difficulty with the title and acronym of the Summer Jobs for Youth Program: It sounded too much like CETA or SYEP. It was only after survey workers had described the program as the "Partnership Jobs Program" or mentioned the New York City Partnership that a significant number of respondents, particularly executives and supervisors, understood what they were being asked to evaluate.

APPENDIX
OF
TABLES

Table 1

Data on Completed Interviews

Completed Interviews by Respondent Category	
Category	Number
Company Executives	62
Supervisors	187
Young Workers	419
Cancelled Jobs	55
15% Preferred Young Workers	112
Total	835

Table 2

Completed Interviews by Respondent Category and Job Referral Source			
	Company Executives	Supervisors	Young Workers
Co-op	15 (24%)	21 (11%)	54 (13%)
COBY	11 (18%)	5 (3%)	8 (2%)
PIC	4 (6%)	22 (12%)	53 (13%)
Job Service	32 (52%)	139 (74%)	298 (71%)
TAP	-	-	6 (1%)
Total	62 (100 %)	187 (100 %)	419 (100 %)

Company Executive Tabulations

Table 3

Reasons for Choosing to Participate In
A Similar Program Next Year

Category	Number of Responses
Benefits for Company	32 (37%)
Community or Public Service	31 (36%)
Prior Performance of Young Workers	23 (27%)
Total	86

Table 4

Reasons for Choosing Not to Participate in a
Similar Program Next Year

Category	Number of Responses
Attitudes of Young Workers	2 (29%)
Behavior of Young Workers	5 (71%)
Total	7

Table 5

Will Participate in SJFY Program Next Year

Category	Number of Responses
Yes	55 (89%)
Undecided/No	7 (11%)
Total	62

Company Executive Tabulations

Table 6

Suggestions for Program Improvement

Category	Number of Responses
Improve Screening/Referral Process	18 (28%)
Improve Student Preparation	32 (49%)
Improve SJFY Program Management	11 (17%)
Create More Jobs	2 (3%)
Other	2 (3%)
Total	65

Table 7

Will Provide a Written Reference for Young Workers

Category	Number of Responses
Yes	56 (90%)
No	4 (7%)
Undecided	2 (3%)
Total	62

Job Site Supervisor Tabulations

Table 8

Ratings of Overall Performance of Young Workers
By Referral Source

Referral Source	Above Average	Average	Below Average	Mixed Performance	TOTAL
Co-op	4	11	1	2	18
COBY	2	3			5
PIC	9	9	3		21
Job Service	53	70	8	9	140
Total	68 (37%)	93 (51%)	12 (6%)	11 (6%)	184 (100%)

Table 9

Areas in Which Young Workers Need to Improve
By Referral Source

Referral Source	Academic Skills	Occupational Skills	Attitudes/ Behavior	Interpersonal Skills	Total
Co-op	6	3	8	2	19
COBY	1	-	-	2	3
PIC	3	1	8	3	15
Job Service	16	32	67	12	127
Total	26 (16%)	36 (22%)	83 (51%)	19 (11%)	164 (100%)

Job Site Supervisor Tabulations

Table 10

Conducted Company Orientation for Young Workers

Yes	No	Did Not Answer
132 (70%)	46 (25%)	9 (5%)

Table 11

Received Materials About SJFY '81

Yes	No	Did Not Answer
89 (48%)	90 (48%)	8 (4%)

Table 12

Job Titles of Respondents

Job Title	Number	Percent
Senior Manager (large firm)	12	6
Senior Manager (small firm)	17	9
Middle Manager	50	27
Work Station Manager	99	53
Job Activity Supervisor	9	5
Total	187	100

Young Worker Tabulations

Table 13

Sex of Respondents

Sex	Number	Percent
Female	237	57
Male	182	43
Total	419	100

Table 14

Ethnic Background of Respondents

Black	Hispanic	Oriental	White	Other
278 (66%)	80 (19%)	25 (6%)	33 (8%)	3 (1%)

Table 15

Type of High School Attended

Academic	Vocational	Alternative	Specialized	Total
356 (85%)	51 (12%)	8 (2%)	4 (1%)	419 (100)

Table 16

Type of Work Performed in SJFY '81

Clerical	Laboratory	Technical	Sales/Service	Manual Labor
250 (60%)	1 (1%)	37 (8%)	42 (10%)	89 (21%)

Young Worker Tabulations

Table 17

Age of Respondents

	Age	Number	Percent
	14	2	.4
	15	5	1
	16	103	25
	17	128	31
	18	122	29
	19	38	9
	20	16	4
	21	2	.4
	22	1	.2
Total	-	417	100

Young Worker Tabulations

Table 18

Would Accept the Same Job Next Summer

Yes	No	Total
352 (84%)	67 (16%)	419 (100%)

Table 19

SJFY '81 Job Has Been A Worthwhile Experience

Yes	No	Not Sure	Not Coded	Total
394 (94%)	16 (4%)	4 (1%)	5 (1%)	419 (100%)

Table 20

Attended Orientation Activity Before Employer Interview

Yes	No	Not Coded	Total
237 (57%)	174 (41%)	8 (2%)	419 (100%)

Youths Worker Tabulation

Table 21

Ratings of Summer '81 Job Experience

Experience Area	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Total
Skills	179 (43%)	190 (45%)	32 (8%)	17 (4%)	418 (100%)
Training	187 (45%)	181 (43%)	35 (8%)	16 (4%)	41 (100%)
Exposure	137 (33%)	179 (43%)	68 (16%)	34 (8%)	418 (100%)
Work Habits	205 (49%)	189 (45%)	20 (5%)	5 (1%)	419 (100%)
Motivation	238 (57%)	161 (38%)	14 (3%)	6 (2%)	419 (100%)
Understanding Work	257 (61%)	150 (36%)	8 (2%)	4 (1%)	419 (100%)
Confidence to Learn	277 (66%)	135 (32%)	5 (1%)	2 (1%)	419 (100%)
Self-Reliance	282 (67%)	125 (30%)	10 (2%)	2 (1%)	419 (100%)
Accepting Criticism	189 (46%)	189 (46%)	30 (7%)	7 (1%)	415 (100%)

Cancelled Job Order Tabulations

Table 22

Reason Job Order Was Cancelled

Reason	Number	Percent
Applicants Not Qualified	12	18
No Referrals/No Applicants	29	44
Hired Other Summer Workers	6	9
Needed Permanent Workers/ Earlier Start/Unusual Hours	12	18
Business Slowdown/ No Jobs	5	8
Other	2	3
Total	66	100

15% Preferred Young Worker Tabulations

Table 23

Reason Young Worker Returned to Public Sector Job

Reasons	Number	Percent
Preferred Public Sector Job	19	17
Public Sector Job Closer to Home	16	14
No Letter or Agency Follow-Through/Moved	30	27
No Jobs/No Private Sector Job Offer	19	17
School Session or Age Criteria Conflict	7	6
Advised Against Private Sector/Did Not Return To Public Sector	4	4
Young Worker Did not Follow-Through	17	15
Total	112	100

15% Preferred Young Worker Tabulations

Table 24

Age of Respondents

	Age	Number	Percent
	15	5	4
	16	16	15
	17	42	38
	18	31	28
	19	8	8
	20	3	3
	21	5	4
Total	-	110	100